

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Eli James Torrence,	)	C/A No. 4:14-1988-BHH-TER
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	Report and Recommendation
Kieth Galloway, Lt. Drew Sisco, Brandon N/A,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

The Plaintiff filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983<sup>1</sup> on May 21, 2014, alleging violations of his constitutional rights. Plaintiff is currently incarcerated at Lieber Correctional Institution. Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment along with a memorandum and affidavits in support of said motion. (Document #22). Because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, he was advised on or about November 13, 2014, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1975), that a failure to respond to the Defendants' motion for summary judgment could result in the dismissal of his complaint. Plaintiff failed to file a response.

**RULE 41(B) DISMISSAL**

---

<sup>1</sup>All pretrial proceedings in this case were referred to the undersigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and (B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), DSC. Because this is a dispositive motion, the report and recommendation is entered for review by the District Judge.

A complaint may be dismissed pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to prosecute and/or failure to comply with orders of the court. Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990), and Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919 (4th Cir. 1982). In considering whether to dismiss an action pursuant to Rule 41(b), the court is required to consider four factors:

- (1) the degree of plaintiff's responsibility in failing to respond;
- (2) the amount of prejudice to the defendant;
- (3) the history of the plaintiff in proceeding in a dilatory manner; and,
- (4) the existence of less drastic sanctions other than dismissal.

Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69 (4th Cir. 1978).

In the present case, the Plaintiff is proceeding pro se so he is entirely responsible for his actions. It is solely through Plaintiff's neglect, and not that of an attorney, that no responses have been filed to this motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff has not responded to Defendant's motion for summary judgment or the court's order requiring him to respond. No other reasonable sanctions are available. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b).

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the above reasoning, it is RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b) with prejudice.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III  
Thomas E. Rogers, III  
United States Magistrate Judge

December 23, 2014  
Florence, South Carolina

**The parties' attention is directed to the important information on the attached notice.**